UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,952	06/25/2003	Peter Lyon Harris 29	22-PDD-99-20-CON-[70P2]	3111
79990 C. R. Bard, Inc.	7590 12/03/201	EXAMINER		
Bard Peripheral 1415 W. 3rd Str	Vascular, Inc.	WILLSE, DAVID H		
P.O. Box 1740	reet	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Tempe, AZ 852	80-1740	3738		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/03/2010	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

BPVIP.Docket@crbard.com Jacki.Daspit@crbard.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/603,952	HARRIS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Bavia II. Willioc	0700
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>November 15, 2010,</u> FAILS TO PLACE TH	IS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(i Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection filed after a filed afte	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially red	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate,	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>		
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
<ul> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	t does NOT place the application ir	n condition for allowance because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
	/David H Willse/	
	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 3738

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Applicant's remarks offer no evidence (such as technical dictionaries or bulletins or journal articles) to support the apparent allegation (Applicant's reply of November 15, 2010: paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3) that "uniform surface" (claim 1, line 3) implies (to a person of ordinary skill in the art) a constant or non-varying diameter along the longitudinal axis of a tubular portion or segment. Regarding Pintauro et al. and claim 1, leakage does not occur when the device is attached into a complementarily shaped oblique cut or when the device is entirely implanted within a vascular structure having an ostium (in a manner similar to that illustrated in Figure 13 of Pintauro et al.). Regarding Matterson and claim 27, the central axis extends beyond the oblique cut (even though the axis is at an angle to the cut), and the inner arc lengths decrease in an outward direction along this central axis (because of said cut). Other issues are adequately addressed in the final Office action of September 16, 2010.